(ग) पानीपत में अमोनिया गैस रिसाव के कारणों की जांच करने के लिए एन० एफ० एल० द्वारा स्थापित की गयी जांच समिति ने व्यक्तिगत रूप से या सामूहिक रूप से उत्तरदायित्व निर्धारित नहीं किया क्योंकि प्रत्यक्ष रूप से ग्रस्त व्यक्ति भी दुर्घटना में मर गए। भटिण्डा में लघु दुर्घटना के लिए एन० एफ० एल० द्वारा कोई विस्तृत जांच करनी आवश्यक नहीं समझी गयी।

Exemption of Betamethasone Disodrum Sulphate from price control

2925. DR. NARREDDY THULASI REDDY:
SHRIMATI SATYA BAHIN:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Betamethasone Disodium Sulphate being used in place of Phosphate has been exempted from price control with effect from 28th Oct. 1992; and

(b) what were the salient features of R and D on account of which it was exempted from price control?

THE MINISTRY OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) Bulk Drug Betamethasone Disodium phosphate has been exempted from price control w.e.f. 28.?.92 on the basis of indigenous R and D efforts, undertaken by M/s. Glaxo Ltd.

(b) The major features of R and D efforts are (i) improvement in the production efficiency (ii) reduction in the cost of production (iii) saving in foreign exchange and (iv) production from basic stage.

Employees of IDPL charge sheeted without specifyign any reason

2926. SHRIMATI SARALA MAHESHWARI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the replies to the Unstarred Questions 2262 dated 30th July, 1992 and 4597 dated 20th August, 1992 respectively and state:

(a) whether chargesheets were issued against to employees by the Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals Limited's disciplinary authorities for unauthorised absence under rule 5 (7) read with rule 25 (of IDPL CDA Rules) in November, 1989;

(b) whether the same chargesheets were issued without specifying any reasons under the signature of the Chairman under rule 5(7) read with rule 25 in May, 1990, if so, the reasons therefor;

(c) whether a notice was issued to the employees for unauthorised absence under new rule 30-a by a junior officer, if so, the reasons therefor; and

(d) whether the employees were asked to reply to the chargesheet of May, 1990 under rule 25 with rule 5(7), in January, 1991, if so, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) to (d) The employees referred to in the question were holding the posts below the Board level. The authority competent to take a decision in matters relating to such employees is the management of the company. The issues raised essentially pertain to the administration of the company. According to the information furnished by Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals Limited (IDPL), a charge sheet was issued to Shri Kamal Bhasin, the then Marketing Executive on 17.11.89 under the signature of General Manager (Production). Later, the same charge sheet was re-issued on 21.5.90, under the signature of the then Chairman and Managing Director who was con-